DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 727 HE 008 789

AUTHOR	Atelsek, Frank J.; Gomberg, Irene L.
TITLE	College and University Services for Older Adults. Higher Education Panel Reports, No. 33.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Institutes of Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.; National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 77
GRANT	NSF-SRS-7517251
NOTE	25p.; Hard copy not available due to marginal legibility of document
AVAILABLE FROM	Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Students; Age; *College Role; *Community Services; Educational Demand; Educational Objectives; *Educational Supply; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Older Adults; State Colleges; State Universities; *Statistical Data; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*Access (Education)

ABSTRACT

The extent and type of services currently offered to older adults are identified, and an overview is provided of institutional plans for increasing such services in the immediate future. In this survey respondents were asked to describe any educational programs or community services available through their institutions designed especially for older adults, and to indicate any requirements such as age or income for participation. Among the 556 colleges and universities responding to the survey, over half offered no instructional programs or community services designed specifically for older adults. Nearly 25 percent provided both instructional and community services, while 5 percent had only instructional services available and 20 percent had only community services available. This report tabulates the types of instructional services, community services, forms of organization, primary sources of funding, and plans for programs and services. It concludes that in general most colleges and universities are still focused on their traditional objective of preparing the young for "life," but that others, particularly the public-supported institutions, are alerted to the academic and service needs of older adults. More attention to older adults is promised for the future. (LBH)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED136727

College and University Services for Older Adults

Frank J. Atelsek and Irene L. Gomberg

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ME 008789

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL REPORTS, NUMBER 33
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

FEBRUARY
1977

A Survey Funded by the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, and the National Institutes of Health.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Roger W. Heyns, *President*

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Higher Education Panel is a survey research program established by the Council for the purpose of securing policy-related information quickly from representative samples of colleges and universities. *Higher Education Panel Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Panel's survey findings to policy-makers in government, in the associations, and in educational institutions across the nation.

The Higher Education Panel's surveys on behalf of the Federal Government are conducted under grant support provided jointly by the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the U. S. Office of Education (NSF Grant SRS-7517251).

STAFF OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Frank J. Atelsek, *Panel Director*

Irene L. Gomberg, *Senior Research Analyst*

Nabil Issa, *Programmer*

Cathy Slesinger, *Research Assistant*

Elaine Chamberlain, *Research Secretary*

HEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lyle H. Lanier, Director, Office of Administrative Affairs and Educational Statistics, ACE, *Chairman*

John A. Creager, Director, Division of Educational Statistics, ACE

W. Todd Furniss, Director, Office of Academic Affairs, ACE

John F. Hughes, Director, Policy Analysis Service, ACE

Charles V. Kidd, Executive Secretary, Association of American Universities

J. Boyd Page, President, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States

FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Charles E. Falk, National Science Foundation, *Chairman*
William E. Rhode, National Institutes of Health
George E. Hall, Office of Management and Budget
Richard T. Sonnergren, U. S. Office of Education
Felix H. Lindsay, National Science Foundation, *Secretary*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Frankel, National Center for Education Statistics, *Chairman*
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation
Tavia Gordon, National Institutes of Health

Additional copies of this report are available from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SERVICES FOR OLDER ADULTS

Frank J. Atelsek
Irene L. Gomberg

Higher Education Panel Reports
Number 33 February 1977

American Council on Education
Washington, D.C. 20036

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	iv
Background	1
Methods Summary	1
Findings	2
Tables	6
Appendix	13
A. Survey Instrument	13
B. Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents	17

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge the assistance of Richard Sonnergren, our sponsor's representative, and Eugene Welden of the Office of Education, and Martin Sicker and Marvin Taves of the Administration on Aging, in the design of the survey. The usual helpful guidance and counsel were provided by the Federal Advisory Board and its Technical Advisory Committee.

Special thanks, above all, are due our Panel representatives and other officials at the participating institutions who make these surveys possible.

Background

It is known that older Americans require a broad range of educational services to assist them in life-change situations and in finding new outlets for skills and interests. Until recently, few colleges and universities have made any special effort to serve older adults in meeting such objectives. However colleges and universities across the country now are being asked to develop a wider range of such programs. Recent legislation (The Education Amendments of 1976) amends Title I of the Higher Education Act to include a new federal initiative in "Lifelong Learning". This legislation establishes a basis for increased federal attention to and participation in the accelerating needs for continuing educational opportunities throughout life. In meeting the growing needs for lifelong educational opportunities, the institutions are strengthening their instructional, research, and public service roles, while at the same time offsetting enrollment declines and budget deficits.

This survey is designed to (1) identify the extent and type of services currently being offered to older adults, and (2) to provide an overview of institutional plans for increasing such services in the immediate future. Specifically, respondents were asked to describe any educational programs or community services available through their institutions designed specially for older adults, and to indicate any requirements (e.g., age, income) for participation. Further, information was sought relative to the organizational units responsible for administering special programs for older adults, the sources of funds used to support these programs, and plans for change in the near future.

Methods Summary

The Higher Education Panel is a continuing research program established in 1971 by the American Council on Education for the purpose of conducting quick-response surveys on issues of current policy interest to government agencies and the higher education community. The Panel is based upon a network of representatives at 642 colleges and universities broadly representative of the more than 3,000 institutions listed in the Office of Education's Education Directory.

The survey instrument was mailed to the Panel representatives at all member institutions in June 1976. To facilitate follow-up, the representatives were asked to complete a return postcard identifying the person at each institution designated to respond to the survey. By the end of August, following mail and telephone follow-up efforts, usable questionnaires had

been received from 556 institutions, for a response rate of 87 percent. Appendix A is a copy of the survey instrument, and Appendix B compares respondent institutions with nonrespondents.

The data, which are presented by control (public, private) and by type (university, four-year college, two-year college) of institution, pertain only to the survey respondents and may not accurately reflect the activities, programs, and services for older adults offered by other higher education institutions.

Findings

Among the 556 colleges and universities responding to the survey, over half offered no instructional programs or community services designed specifically for older adults. Nearly one-fourth provided both instructional and community services, while 5 percent had only instructional services available and 20 percent had only community services available (Table 1).

Instructional Services

Fewer than 30 percent of all respondents offered any instructional programs specifically designed for older adults: courses geared toward a second career, preretirement courses, self-improvement or leisure-time courses, short-term residential courses. (Table 2)

The extent of such offerings varied widely by type of institution. Overall, public institutions were much more involved in instruction for older adults than were private institutions; in particular, 52 percent of public universities and 58 percent of the public two-year colleges reported having instructional programs for older adults, whereas only 23 percent of the private universities and 11 percent of the private two-year colleges reported such offerings.

Of the 160 institutions offering specialized instructional programs for older adults, more than one-third reported having three or more such programs. Public institutions were much more likely than private institutions to offer this many programs (18 percent and 6 percent, respectively).

These instructional programs were usually oriented toward self-improvement/leisure-time courses and preretirement courses (offered by 22 percent and 15 percent, respectively, of all responding institutions [Table 3], and three-fourths and one-half, respectively, of the participating institutions only [Table 4]). About one-third of the participating colleges and universities offered courses geared to a second career, and 30 percent offered special short-term residential courses.

Fewer than 30 percent of the instructional programs available were subject to any specific requirements for participation, and those were primarily minimum age requirements.

Community Services

Respondents were asked also to identify other kinds of services which they provided to older adults: vocational or social counseling, legal services, medical or psychiatric services, institutional services (e.g., special tuition plans, library privileges), reduced fees, recreational programs. Overall, 243 institutions (44 percent) reported offering one or more service-oriented programs.

Not only were public institutions more likely than private institutions to offer community service programs, but they also offered a wider variety of services (Table 5). For example, 70 percent of the public two-year colleges offered some service programs; and of these, 80 percent offered three or more distinct programs. Similarly, over three-fifths of the public universities provided such service programs; and three-fifths of this group reported three or more program offerings.

Most of the community service programs designed for older adults were academic in nature, serving to facilitate reentry into and participation in higher education (Table 6). Two-thirds of the institutions with community service programs, for example, cited special tuition plans; two-fifths extended library privileges; well over one-third cited special admissions policies; one-fourth reported special recruiting efforts, and more than one-fifth offered academic counseling (Table 7). Other frequently mentioned services include: reduced fees for services or events on campus (reported by 37 percent), recreational or cultural programs (35 percent), and the use of meeting, recreational, or vocational facilities (30 percent).

Again the only significant requirement for participation in most community services programs was minimum age. As many as 72 percent of respondent institutions providing special tuition plans had age requirements, while only 12 percent offering vocational counseling had age requirements.

Unique Programs

Of the more than 1300 reported special programs operated for older adults, 183 programs were considered by respondents to be particularly unique. The most frequently mentioned were of an educational nature (38 percent), for example, a series of special educational television programs, a "mini-college" operated by emeritus faculty for elderly students, a rural life-time learning institute. Seventeen percent of the programs considered unique were recreational or cultural (e.g., bus tours, art classes), and 14 percent involved the provision of health services (e.g., a self-help program in health care, a nutrition program including meal services

and nutrition education).

Forms of Organization

As a measure of the extent to which the responding colleges and universities have "institutionalized" their efforts to serve older adults, one questionnaire item asked: Is there a formal unit on your campus that has responsibility for coordinating or directing your institution's efforts to serve older adults? Overall, one-fourth reported having a formal unit for this purpose (Table 8). At these institutions, the organizational unit directing the effort was most likely to be part of the institution's continuing education program (35 percent), though one-fifth specified that the unit was a senior citizens program. The units responsible for services to older adults most often reported directly to the executive level within the institution (42 percent).

Primary Sources of Funding

The 272 institutions which indicated making special efforts to serve older adults were asked about the sources of funding for their programs. Table 9 shows the distribution of primary sources of funding (*primary source* being defined as that source which provided the greatest share of the program funds at each institution). Most frequently, the primary funds came from internal institutional sources (31 percent). Other primary sources were, in order of frequency: fees charged to participants (18 percent), local or state government (17 percent), and federal government (15 percent). Proportionately, private institutions drew primary support from internal institutional sources much more frequently than did public institutions (47 percent and 19 percent, respectively).

Plans for Programs/Services

Overall, about one-third of the responding institutions acknowledged having plans for additions or changes in their programs and services for older adults. About two in five of the public institutions and 27 percent of the private institutions reported that they planned additions or changes during the next two years (Table 10). Most often, these plans involved initiating programs and services for older adults (mentioned by 36 percent). Also frequently mentioned were intentions to expand existing classes and services (32 percent) and to add new programs (24 percent). Some of the initiatives include an associate degree program, for and about senior citizens; career-change studies; and special training programs for recreational services for older adults.

Apparently, current program status has much to do with an institution's plans for the immediate future (Table 11). Of the institutions which reported programs and services for older adults, 46 percent were planning to increase the scope of their efforts. Only 19 percent of those without such programs were planning to do so.

Conclusion

In a general sense, most colleges and universities are still focused on their traditional objective: preparing the young for "life". But on the periphery, new goals of community service are already in place. Older adults are beginning to benefit from the broadened attention to the concept of lifetime learning. The results of the present survey indicate that institutions of higher education, particularly the publicly supported institutions, are alerted to the academic and service needs of older adults, and that their offerings to this segment of the population will increase in the immediate years ahead. While the survey data do not show a ground-swell of participation in such programs and services, the remarks of the institutional respondents and the literature they have provided about their program plans do suggest that lifetime learning has attracted their interest and has a solid start in many institutions. Their commitment to self-help programs and service programs which draw on the facilities and expertise available at institutions of higher education promises more attention to older adults in the near future.

Table 1

Percentage of Responding Institutions Providing Services to Older Adults (Approximately 55 Years of Age or Older) by Type and Control

Services Provided	Total Respondents (N=556)	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N= 57)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 89)	Universities (N= 80)	Total (N=226)	Two-Year Colleges (N=28)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 250)	Universities (N= 52)	Total (N=330)
None	51.1	22.8	48.3	30.0	35.4	67.9	63.2	51.9	61.8
Only Instructional Services	5.2	7.0	5.6	8.8	7.1	0	4.8	1.9	3.9
Only Community Services	20.1	19.3	22.5	17.5	19.9	21.4	19.2	25.0	20.3
Both Instructional and Community Services	23.6	50.9	23.6	43.8	37.6	10.7	12.8	21.2	13.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 2

Percent of Responding Institutions With and Without Instructional Services for Older Adults, by Type and Control

Institution	Total Respondents		With Instructional Services				Without Instructional Services
	Number	Percent	1 Program	2 Programs	3 or More Programs	Total	
Total Public	226	100.0	18.6	8.4	17.7	44.7	55.3
Two-Year	57	100.0	22.8	10.5	24.6	57.9	42.1
Four-Year	89	100.0	12.4	5.6	11.2	29.2	70.8
University	80	100.0	22.5	10.0	20.0	52.5	47.5
Total Private	330	100.0	8.2	3.9	5.8	17.9	82.1
Two-Year	28	100.0	7.1	3.6	0	10.7	89.3
Four-Year	250	100.0	7.6	3.6	6.4	17.6	82.4
University	52	100.0	11.5	5.8	5.8	23.1	76.9
Total	556	100.0	12.4	5.8	10.6	28.8	71.2

Table 3

Percent of Responding Institutions With Instructional Services for Older Adults, by Type and Control

Instructional Services Available	Total Respondents (N=556)	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N= 57)	Four-Year Colleges (N=89)	Universities (N=80)	Total (N=226)	Two-Year Colleges (N=28)	Four-Year Colleges (N=250)	Universities (N= 52)	Total (N=330)
None	71.2	42.1	70.8	47.5	55.3	89.3	82.4	76.9	82.1
Courses Geared Toward a Second Career	9.9	17.5	11.2	20.0	15.9	0	6.8	3.8	5.8
Preretirement Courses	14.7	33.3	12.4	33.8	25.2	3.6	6.8	12.5	7.6
Self-Improvement or Leisure-Time Courses	21.9	47.4	20.2	35.0	32.3	10.7	15.2	15.4	14.8
Short-Term Residential Courses	8.6	21.1	10.1	16.2	15.0	0	4.8	3.8	4.2
Other	5.8	10.5	7.9	8.8	8.8	0	2.8	9.6	3.6

NOTE: Column totals exceed 100 percent because of multiple response

Table 4

Percent of Responding Institutions With Instructional Services for Older Adults Among Those Reporting At Least One Additional Service, by Type and Control

Instructional Services Available	Respondents With Instructional Services (N=160)	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N= 33)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 26)	Universities (N= 42)	Total (N=101)	Two-Year Colleges (N= 3)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 44)	Universities (N=12)	Total (N=59)
Courses Geared Toward a Second Career	34.4	30.3	38.5	38.1	35.6	0	38.6	16.7	32.2
Preretirement Courses	51.2	57.6	42.3	64.3	56.4	33.3	38.6	58.3	42.4
Self-Improvement or Leisure-Time Courses	76.2	81.8	69.2	66.7	72.3	100.0	86.4	66.7	83.0
Short-Term Residential Courses	30.0	36.4	34.6	31.0	33.7	0	27.3	16.7	23.7
Other	20.0	18.2	26.9	16.7	19.8	0	15.9	41.7	20.3

Note: Column totals exceed 100 percent because of multiple response.

Table 5

Percent of Responding Institutions with and Without Community Services for Older Adults, by Type and Control

Institution	Total Respondents		With Community Services				Without Community Services
	Number	Percent	1 Program	2 Programs	3 or more Programs	Total	
Total Public	226	100.0	14.6	7.1	35.8	57.5	42.5
Two-Year	57	100.0	5.3	8.8	56.1	70.2	29.8
Four-Year	89	100.0	19.1	6.7	20.2	46.1	53.9
University	80	100.0	16.2	6.2	38.8	61.2	38.8
Total Private	330	100.0	9.4	5.2	19.7	34.2	65.8
Two-Year	28	100.0	7.1	0	25.0	32.1	67.9
Four-Year	250	100.0	8.0	4.8	19.2	32.0	68.0
University	52	100.0	17.3	9.6	19.2	46.2	53.8
Total	556	100.0	11.5	5.9	26.3	43.7	56.3

Table 7

Percent of Responding Institutions with Community Services for Older Adults Among Those Reporting at Least One Community Service, by Type and Control

Community Services Available	Respondents With Community Services (N=243)	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N= 40)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 41)	Universities (N= 49)	Total (N=130)	Two-Year Colleges (N= 9)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 80)	Universities (N= 24)	Total (N=113)
Vocational counseling program	13.2	12.5	12.2	22.4	16.2	0	10.0	12.5	9.7
Social counseling program	11.5	15.0	4.9	14.3	11.5	0	11.2	16.7	11.5
Legal services program	8.6	10.0	2.4	12.2	8.5	11.1	3.8	25.0	8.8
Medical or psychiatric services program	7.8	7.5	4.9	16.3	10.0	0	2.5	16.7	5.3
Institutional services									
Food service privileges	9.9	12.5	14.6	10.2	12.3	11.1	8.8	0	7.1
Special transportation services	8.2	22.5	0	12.2	11.5	11.1	5.0	0	4.4
Living accommodations	3.7	0	4.9	2.0	2.3	0	7.5	0	5.3
Use of meeting, recreational or vocational facilities	30.4	57.5	29.3	18.4	33.8	44.4	31.2	4.2	26.6
Other	3.7	2.5	4.9	0	2.3	0	6.2	4.2	5.3
Educational services									
Special recruiting efforts	25.1	30.0	29.3	24.5	27.7	33.3	20.0	25.0	22.1
Special admissions policies	37.0	52.5	36.6	32.7	40.0	77.8	33.8	16.7	33.6
Special tuition plan	67.1	65.0	63.4	59.2	62.3	100.0	73.8	58.3	72.6
Academic counseling	22.2	37.5	24.4	32.7	31.5	55.6	26.2	16.7	26.6
Library privileges	40.3	70.0	29.3	26.5	40.8	66.7	40.0	29.2	39.8
Other	5.4	5.0	9.8	2.0	5.4	0	5.0	8.3	5.3
Reduced fees for services/events on campus	37.4	60.0	31.7	24.5	37.7	66.7	40.0	16.7	37.2
Recreational/cultural programs	35.0	60.0	22.0	32.6	37.7	44.4	35.0	16.7	31.9
Special programs/benefits for elderly alumni/alumnae	20.2	17.5	12.2	34.7	22.3	11.1	17.5	20.8	17.7
Other	9.5	10.0	14.6	16.3	13.8	0	3.8	8.3	4.4

Note: Column totals exceed 100 percent because of multiple response.

Table 6

Percent of Responding Institutions With Community Services for Older Adults, by Type and Control

Community Services Available	Total Respondents (N=556)	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N= 57)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 89)	Universities (N= 80)	Total (N=226)	Two-Year Colleges (N= 28)	Four-Year Colleges (N=250)	Universities (N=52)	Total (N=330)
Vocational counseling program	5.8	8.8	5.6	13.8	9.3	0	3.2	5.8	3.3
Social counseling program	5.0	10.5	2.2	8.8	6.6	0	3.6	7.7	3.9
Legal services program	3.8	7.0	1.1	7.5	4.9	3.6	1.2	11.5	3.0
Medical or psychiatric services program	3.4	5.3	2.2	10.0	5.8	0	.8	7.7	1.8
Institutional services									
Food service privileges	4.3	8.8	6.7	6.2	7.1	3.6	2.8	0	2.4
Special transportation services	3.6	15.8	0	7.5	6.6	3.6	1.6	0	1.5
Living accommodations	1.6	0	2.2	1.2	1.3	0	2.4	0	1.8
Use of meeting, recreational or vocational facilities	13.3	40.4	13.5	11.2	19.5	14.3	10.0	1.9	9.1
Other	1.6	1.8	2.2	0	1.3	0	2.0	1.9	1.8
Educational services									
Special recruiting efforts	11.0	21.1	13.5	15.0	15.9	10.7	6.4	11.5	7.6
Special admissions policies	16.2	36.8	16.9	20.0	23.0	25.0	10.8	7.7	11.5
Special tuition plan	29.3	45.6	29.2	36.2	35.8	32.1	23.6	26.9	24.8
Academic counseling	12.8	26.3	11.2	20.0	18.1	17.9	8.4	7.7	9.1
Library privileges	17.6	49.1	13.5	16.2	23.5	21.4	12.8	13.5	13.6
Other	2.3	3.5	4.5	1.2	3.1	0	1.6	3.8	1.8
Reduced fees for services/events on campus	16.4	42.1	14.6	15.0	21.7	21.4	12.8	7.7	12.7
Recreational/cultural programs	15.8	42.1	10.1	20.0	21.7	14.3	11.2	7.7	10.9
Special programs/benefits for elderly alumni/alumnae	8.8	12.3	5.6	21.2	12.8	3.6	5.6	9.6	6.1
Other	4.1	7.0	6.7	10.0	8.0	0	1.2	3.8	1.5
No services	56.3	29.8	53.9	38.8	42.5	67.9	68.0	53.8	65.8

Note: Column totals exceed 100 percent because of multiple response.

Table 8

Responding Institutions with Formal Organizational Units Responsible for Coordinating Efforts to Serve Older Adults, by Type and Control
(In Percentages)

Characteristic	Total Respondents (N=539)	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N=56)	Four-Year Colleges (N=88)	Universities (N=77)	Total (N=221)	Two-Year Colleges (N=26)	Four-Year Colleges (N=240)	Universities (N=52)	Total (N=318)
With formal unit	26.2	55.4	30.7	31.2	37.1	11.5	17.5	26.9	18.6
Total with formal unit	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Name of unit									
Community services	13.9	33.3	13.0	4.4	17.8	0	8.6	8.3	8.2
Continuing education	35.2	18.5	30.4	30.4	26.0	50.0	57.1	25.0	49.0
Extension program	8.2	7.4	4.4	13.0	8.2	0	5.7	16.7	8.2
Senior citizens program	20.5	14.8	26.1	30.4	23.3	0	14.3	25.0	16.3
Special program	22.1	25.9	26.1	21.7	24.7	50.0	14.3	25.0	18.4
Level of office to which unit reports									
Upper level (e.g., President, Vice-President)	42.4	32.3	52.2	58.3	46.2	33.3	30.2	60.0	37.7
Middle level (e.g., Dean)	36.	29.0	21.7	20.8	24.4	33.3	60.5	26.7	50.8
Lower level (all other)	21.6	38.7	26.1	20.8	29.5	33.3	9.3	13.3	11.5

Table 9

Percentage Distribution of Responding Institutions Reporting At Least One Instructional or Community Service, by Primary Source of Funds for Services to Older Adults and by Type and Control of Institution

Primary Source	Respondents with Services (N=178)[a]	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N= 33)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 32)	Universities (N= 39)	Total (N=104)	Two-Year Colleges (N= 6)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 51)	Universities (N=17)	Total (N=74)
Local/State Government	7.4	36.4	31.3	20.5	28.8	0	0	5.9	1.4
Federal Government	14.6	24.2	12.5	12.8	16.3	16.7	11.8	11.8	12.2
Institutional Funds	30.9	21.2	25.0	12.8	19.2	50.0	45.1	52.9	47.3
Private Donors	4.5	3.0	6.3	2.6	3.8	16.7	5.9	0	5.4
Fees charged to participants	18.0	6.1	12.5	28.2	16.3	0	23.5	17.6	20.3
Mixed	14.6	9.1	12.5	23.1	15.4	16.7	13.7	11.8	13.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a] Of the 272 survey respondents providing some service, only 178 responded to this question.

Table 10

Specific Additions or Changes Planned for the Next Two Years in Programs/Services Designed for Older Adults Among Institutions Reporting At Least One Instructional or Community Service, by Type and Control of Institution

(In Percentages)

Plans	Total Respondents (N=556)	Public				Private			
		Two-Year Colleges (N= 57)	Four-Year Colleges (N=89)	Universities (N= 80)	Total (N=226)	Two-Year Colleges (N=28)	Four-Year Colleges (N= 250)	Universities (N= 52)	Total (N=330)
No response	35.8	29.8	28.1	35.0	31.0	39.3	40.4	32.7	39.1
No plans	31.8	21.1	34.8	26.2	28.3	39.3	33.2	36.5	34.2
Some plans	32.4	49.1	37.1	38.8	40.7	21.4	26.4	30.8	26.7
Reduced/no fees	12.2	3.6	9..	19.4	10.9	0	16.7	6.2	13.6
Expansion of classes/ services	32.2	53.6	36.4	41.9	43.5	10.7	18.2	31.2	20.5
Additional programs	23.9	39.3	18.2	16.1	23.9	50.0	21.2	25.0	23.9
Increased recruiting	10.6	10.7	12.1	0	7.6	32.3	12.1	12.5	13.6
Special programs	10.0	14.3	21.2	6.5	14.1	0	7.6	0	5.7
Initiate programs	36.1	17.9	10.3	22.6	23.9	0	54.5	43.8	48.9
Use of facilities	3.3	7.1	.0	0	2.2	16.7	3.0	6.2	.5

NOTE: Column totals exceed 100 percent because of multiple response.

Table 11

Specific Additions or Changes for the Next Two Years in Programs Designed for Older Adults Among Institutions Reporting At Least One Instructional or Community Service, by Current Program Status and Control

(In Percentages)

Plans	Institutions Which Currently Have Such Programs			Institutions Which Currently Do Not Have Such Programs		
	Total (N=272)	Public (N=146)	Private (N=126)	Total (N=284)	Public (N=80)	Private (N=204)
No response	27.6	24.7	31.0	43.7	42.5	44.1
No plans	26.5	26.0	27.0	37.0	32.5	39.7
Some plans	46.0	49.3	42.1	19.4	25.0	17.2
Reduced tuition/ no fees	12.5	11.1	15.1	10.9	10.0	11.4
Expansion of classes/services	41.6	50.0	30.2	10.9	20.0	5.7
Additional programs	28.0	26.4	30.2	14.5	15.0	14.3
Increased recruiting	13.6	9.7	18.9	3.6	0	5.7
Special programs	11.2	15.3	5.7	7.3	10.0	5.7
Initiate programs	24.8	13.9	39.6	61.8	60.0	62.9
Use of Facilities	4.0	2.8	5.7	1.8	0	2.9

NOTE: Column totals exceed 100 percent because of multiple response.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

June 11, 1976

Dear Higher Education Panel Representative:

Enclosed is Higher Education Panel Survey No. 33, "College and University Services for Older Adults". This survey is designed to identify the extent of current services and those planned for the immediate future which are aimed specifically at the educational and other service needs of older adults. We believe this effort will provide the first overall inventory of the range of services being provided to older adults at colleges and universities.

In this context, the term "older adults" refers to those persons 55 years of age and older. However, your institution may use different criteria, and in some instances the age criteria may vary from program to program. Please answer the questionnaire as completely as possible, providing all the information available, particularly with respect to age and other restrictions and requirements.

We would appreciate it if you would return the survey form by *June 30, 1976*. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. As usual, individual responses will be held in strictest confidence, and results will be reported only by institutional groupings.

Thank you for your continued support and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Atelsek

Frank Atelsek
Director

P.S. To help us keep better track of the survey, we ask that you complete and return the enclosed postcard identifying the person you designate to respond to the survey. This will also allow us to direct our future inquiries about the survey to the appropriate office and person. Please return the postcard as soon as possible.

American Council on Education
Higher Education Panel Survey No. 33

OMB#99-0265
exp.6/76

College and University Services for Older Adults

I. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Does your institution operate any educational programs specially designed and organized to serve older adults (approximately 55 years of age or as defined by your institution)?

Yes____ → No____Please go to Section II

If "yes" please check all of the following instructional programs/courses which are available and whether there are specific requirements for participation:

Limit response to programs specifically meant for older adults	Programs Available	Is There a Requirement for: Age	Income Level	Other
1. Courses geared toward a second career	____	( )	( )	( )
2. Preretirement courses	____	( )	( )	( )
3. Self-improvement or leisure-time courses	____	( )	( )	( )
4. Short-term residential courses	____	( )	( )	( )
5. Other: specify_____				

II. COMMUNITY SERVICES: Does your institution operate any organized community services specially designed to benefit older adults?

Yes____ → No____Please go to Section III

If "yes" please check all of the following which are available at your institution (or operated by your institution elsewhere) and whether there are specific requirements for participation:

Limit response to programs specifically meant for older adults	Programs Available	Is There a Requirement for: Age	Income Level	Other
1. Vocational counseling program	____	( )	( )	( )
2. Social counseling program	____	( )	( )	( )
3. Legal services program	____	( )	( )	( )
4. Medical or psychiatric services program	____	( )	( )	( )
5. Institutional services				
a. Food service privileges	____	( )	( )	( )
b. Special transportation services	____	( )	( )	( )
c. Living accommodations	____	( )	( )	( )
d. Use of meeting, recreational or vocational facilities	____	( )	( )	( )
e. Other: specify_____	____	( )	( )	( )
6. Educational services				
a. Special recruiting efforts	____	( )	( )	( )
b. Special admissions policies	____	( )	( )	( )
c. Special tuition plan	____	( )	( )	( )
d. Academic counseling	____	( )	( )	( )
e. Library privileges	____	( )	( )	( )
f. Other: specify_____	____	( )	( )	( )
7. Reduced fees for services/events on campus	____	( )	( )	( )
8. Recreational/cultural programs	____	( )	( )	( )
9. Special programs/benefits for elderly alumni/alumnae	____	( )	( )	( )
10. Other: specify_____	____	( )	( )	( )

III. Please describe any instructional or community service programs at your institution which you consider particularly unique.

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. ORGANIZATION: Is there a formal organizational unit on your campus that has responsibility for coordinating or directing your institution's efforts to serve older adults?

Yes____ No____ Please go to Section V

If "yes": What is the name of the unit?_____

To whom does it report?_____

V. FINANCING: If special efforts for older adults have been made at your institution, please indicate below the approximate percentage of funds obtained from each source:

	Approximate %
Local/state government	_____
Federal government	_____
Institutional funds	_____
Private donors	_____
Fees charged to participants	_____
TOTAL	100%

VI. PLANS: Given your institution's current involvement in providing services to older adults, what specific additions or changes are planned for the next two years?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please provide us with copies of brochures or other literature you may have about any of the programs referred to in this survey.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. Please return this form by *June 30, 1976*.

PLEASE RETAIN A COPY OF THIS SURVEY FOR YOUR RECORDS

TO: HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

Person Completing Form_____

Office_____

Phone_____

Any questions? Call (collect) 202-833-4757

Appendix B:

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Overall, the response rate among the 642 Panel institutions surveyed was 87 percent. Column (4) of Table B-1 shows the response rates separately for public and private institutions; for universities, four-year and two-year institutions; by regional distribution; by size of enrollments; and by a measure of current fund expenditures. With few exceptions, the level of response was similar among the Panel members having different institutional characteristics.

Table B-1

Response to HEP Survey No. 33
College and University Services for Older Adults

Institutional Characteristic	Population (N=3036) (1)	Respondents (N=556) (2)	Nonrespondents (N=86) (3)	Panel Response Rate (4)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.6
Control				
Public	47.7	40.6	38.4	87.3
Private	52.3	59.4	61.6	86.2
Full Type				
Public Two-Year	29.8	10.3	7.0	90.5
Private Two-Year	8.2	5.0	9.3	77.8
Public Four-Year	15.2	16.0	20.9	83.2
Private Four-Year	41.4	45.0	46.5	86.2
Public University	3.2	14.4	10.5	89.9
Private University	2.2	9.4	5.8	91.2
Census Region				
Northeast	25.8	26.9	30.6	85.1
North Central	27.1	28.5	28.2	86.8
South	31.0	29.4	30.6	86.2
West	16.0	15.2	10.6	90.3
FTE Enrollment (1974)				
$\leq$600	32.6	12.4	11.6	87.3
601 - 1,500	29.5	29.1	31.4	85.7
1,501 - 5,000	24.2	25.9	31.4	84.2
5,001 - 10,000	8.7	15.3	12.8	88.5
>10,000	5.0	17.3	12.8	89.7
Current Fund Expenditures (1974)				
$\leq$$5 million	63.7	36.9	38.4	86.1
>$5 $\leq$ 10 million	16.8	20.5	23.3	85.1
>$10 $\leq$ 25 million	11.1	14.6	14.0	87.1
>$25 $\leq$ 50 million	3.6	9.2	9.3	86.4
>$50 million	4.8	18.9	15.1	89.0

A note of caution is in order, however, to those readers who would use the results of this survey as representative of the entire population of institutions from which the Higher Education Panel is drawn. The Panel is a stratified sample which, by itself, cannot be taken as a direct sample representation of the institutional population. National estimates for the population of institutions can be achieved only through a weighting procedure which adjusts for the different Panel-to-population ratios within each cell of the stratification design. The present report only provides unweighted data for those Panel institutions responding to the survey. A comparison of the percentage distributions shown in columns (1) and (2) in Table B-1 describes how the respondents to the present survey differ in selected characteristics from the institutional population as a whole. The Panel respondents include greater proportions of private institutions, of universities, of institutions with large enrollments, and institutions with relatively high levels of expenditure.

More specifically, the Panel respondents, as compared with the entire population of institutions, include:

- a greater proportion of private institutions (59 percent of the Panel respondents vs. 52 percent of the population)
- a smaller proportion of two-year institutions (15 percent vs. 38 percent)
- a greater proportion of institutions with enrollments of 5000 or more students (33 percent vs. 14 percent)
- a smaller proportion of institutions whose current fund expenditures are $5 million or less (37 percent vs. 64 percent)

It should be noted again that these differences are primarily an outgrowth of the disproportionate stratification design used in selecting the sample institutions for the Panel. Actual survey biases arising from nonrespondents within the Panel are relatively small for the institutional characteristics shown in Table B-1. These differences are shown in columns (1) and (2).

Other Reports of the Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education

Blandford, B. and Dutton, D. **Survey of First-Year Graduate and Postdoctoral Enrollment in Science and Engineering.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 1, August, 1971.

Blandford, B. and Dutton, D. **Research Support for Science Faculty.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 2, November, 1971.

Astin, A., Blandford, B., and Mahn, T. **Freshman Class Vacancies in Fall 1971 and Recent Trends in Enrollment of Minority Freshmen.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 3, February, 1972.

Changes in Graduate Programs in Science and Engineering 1970-72 and 1972-74. Science Resources Studies Highlights. Washington: National Science Foundation, July, 1972.

Blandford, B. and Sell, C. **Enrollment of Junior-Year Students (1970 and 1971).** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 5, April, 1972.

Trexler, J. and Blandford, B. **What College Presidents Are Reading.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 6, March, 1972.

Trexler, J. and Kent, L. **Commercial Theme-Writing Services.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 7, June, 1972.

Furniss, W. T. **Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice.** ACE Special Report, July, 1972.

Bayer, A. E. and Astin, A. W. **War Protest on U. S. Campuses During April 1972.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 9, May, 1972.

Blandford, B. A. and Trexler, J. C. **Expected First-Year Graduate Enrollment in Science and Engineering, Fall 1972.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 10, August, 1972.

Blandford, B. A. **Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 11, October, 1972.

Dutton, J. E. and Blandford, B. A. **Enrollment of Junior-Year Students (1971 and 1972).** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 12, April, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. **Courses and Enrollment in Ethnic/Racial Studies.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 14, August, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. and Jenkins, M. D. **The Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 15, August, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. and El-Khawas, E. H. **Production of Doctorates in Selected Fields, 1972-1975.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 16, April, 1974.

Dutton, J. E. **First-Year Enrollment for Masters or Higher Degrees, Fall 1973.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 17, April, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **The Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs, Fall 1973.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 18, April, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **Enrollment of Minority Graduate Students at Ph.D. Granting Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 19, August, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. **College and University Facilities: Expectations of Space and Maintenance Needs for Fall 1974.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 20, September, 1974.

Kinzer, J. L. and El-Khawas, E. H. **Compensation Practices for Graduate Research Assistants: A Survey of Selected Doctoral Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 21, October, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Furniss, W. T. **Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: 1972 and 1974.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 22, December, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **A Survey of Continuing Education Opportunities Available to Nonacademic Scientists, Engineers and Mathematicians,** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 23, April, 1975.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minority Students, 1973-74.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 24, January, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Nonfederal Funding of Biomedical Research and Development: A Survey of Doctoral Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 25, July, 1975.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Major Field Enrollment of Junior-Year Students, 1973 and 1974.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 26, April, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Student Assistance: Participants and Programs, 1974-75.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 27, July, 1975.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Health Research Facilities: A Survey of Doctorate-Granting Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 28, February, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Faculty Research: Level of Activity and Choice of Area.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 29, January, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctorate Faculty in Selected Science and Engineering Departments, 1975 to 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 30, August, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Foreign Area Research Support Within Organized Research Centers at Selected Universities, FY 1972 and 1976.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 32, December, 1976.

Single copies of the above reports may be obtained from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.